

REMARKS

Claims 3-8, 11-16, 19-24, 27-32, 35-41, and 44-50 are pending in the above-identified application. Claims 3, 4, 6-8, 11, 12, 14-16, 19, 20, 22-24, 27, 28, 30-32, 35, 36, 38-41, 44, 45 and 47-50 were rejected, and claims 5, 13, 21, 29, 37 and 46 were objected to. With this Amendment, claims 3, 11, 19, 27, 35, and 44 were amended, and claims 51-56 were added. Accordingly, claims 3-8, 11-16, 19-24, 27-32, 35-41, and 44-56 are at issue.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 102 Anticipation Rejection of Claims

Claims 3, 4, 11-12, 19-20, 27-28, 35-36, 41, 44-45 and 50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Takahashi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,347,185). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 3 is directed to a method for classifying signals, and includes classifying the signal of each block into a category according to the characteristic quantities thereof. The signal of each block is classified into any of the categories formed on the basis of types structures that signals may have and do not depend on the types of signal sources.

The Examiner states that Takashi et al. teaches this limitation by teaching that the audio signal is classified according to whether the segment is silence ("muted audio"), music or speech as shown in column 2, lines 10-12. Contrary to the Examiner's statement, however, muted audio, music and speech do not relate to the types structure of the signal; rather they relate to the signal source. Thus, Takahashi et al. does not disclose or suggest a method for classifying signals wherein the signal of each block is classified into any of the categories formed on the basis of types structures that signals may have and do not depend on the types of signal sources, as required by claim 3. Because claim 3 includes limitations that are neither disclosed nor

suggested by Takahashi et al., claim 3 is allowable over Takahashi et al. For reasons similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 3, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 11, 19, 27, 35, and 44 are also allowable over Takahashi et al. Additionally, claims 4, 12, 20, 28, 36, 41, 45 and 50, which ultimately depend from claims 3, 11, 19, 27, 35, and 44 are also allowable by virtue of their respective dependencies from allowable independent claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims

Claims 6-7, 14-15, 22-23, 30-31, 38-39 and 47-48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi et al. in view of Pertrushin (U.S. Patent No. 6,151,571). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As discussed above, Takahashi et al. does not disclose a method and an apparatus for classifying signals and generating descriptors, wherein the signal of each block is classified into any of the categories formed on the basis of types structures that signals may have and do not depend on the types of signal sources, as required by claims 3, 11, 19, 27, 35, and 44. Thus, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the disclosure of Takahashi et al. with the teachings of Pertrushin to derive claims 6-7, 14-15, 22-23, 30-31, 38-39 and 47-48, which depend from claims 3, 11, 19, 27, 35, and 44, respectively. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 6-7, 14-15, 22-23, 30-31, 38-39 and 47-48 are allowable over Takahashi et al. in view of Pertrushin, and respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 8, 16, 24, 32, 40, and 49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi et al. in view of Wu et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,006,179). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As discussed above, Takahashi et al. does not disclose a method and an apparatus for classifying signals and generating descriptors, wherein the signal of each block is classified into any of the categories formed on the basis of types structures that signals may have and do not depend on the types of signal sources, as required by claims 3, 11, 19, 27, 35, and 44. Thus, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the disclosure of Takahashi et al. with the teachings of Wu et al. to derive claims 8, 16, 24, 32, 40 and 49, which depend from claims 3, 11, 19, 27, 35, and 44, respectively. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 8, 16, 24, 32, 40 and 49 are allowable over Takahashi et al. in view of Wu et al., and respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

IV. Objection To Claims

Claims 5, 13, 21, 29, 37, and 46 are objected to as being depending upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.


Applicants have not amended claim 5, 13, 21, 29, 37, and 46, but respectfully submit that these claims are allowable by virtue of their dependencies from claims 3, 11, 19, 27, 35, and 44, respectively. Accordingly, Applicants submit that this objection has been obviated, and respectfully request its withdrawal.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that all claims are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully request early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 16, 2004

By: 

Marina N. Saito
Registration No. 42,121
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000